

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner rejected claims 29-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Le et al., US 5,883,956. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

First, contrary to what is stated in the Office Action, Le fails to teach or suggest “an encrypted token.” Specifically, the Office Action equates the capability table in Le with the token of the presently claimed invention. However, even assuming these two objects are similar, nothing in Le teaches or suggests encrypting the capability table. Le merely suggests the use of decryption technology to verify the authenticity of a network administrator who attempts to alter or replace the capability table. Specifically, as stated in Col. 5, lines 35-51, the network administrator creates a digital certificate using a key and this certificate is sent to the SPU along with the new capability table. The SPU then is able to verify the message from the network administrator using the digital certificate. While it can be argued that the certificate itself is encrypted, the capability table is not. The digital certification process is described further in Col. 10, lines 30-50. Col. 10, line 51 through col. 11, line 9 then describes the process of loading the capability table into memory of the SPU. Nothing in this paragraph suggests that the capability table is encrypted when it is placed in memory. Rather the keys are merely used to verify the digital certificate, which then allows the storage of the capability table to proceed. As such, since there is no encrypted capability table, there is not encrypted token and Le fails to teach or suggest that element of independent claims 29, 33, 35, 37, 39, 43, and 47.

Second, even if the Examiner maintains that Le teaches the encryption of a token, Le fails to teach or suggest the encryption of a token using the MAC address of the system. The Office Action points to column 6, lines 1-4 as allegedly teaching generation of a key using a MAC address and subsequent encryption of a token using that key. However, this section of Le is merely describing generation of a key using a serial number and/or model number of the SPU, not a MAC address. Serial numbers, model numbers, and MAC addresses are different types of objects. Claims 29, 33, 35, 37, 39, 43, and 47 have been amended to make this distinction more clear. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 29, 33, 35, 37, 39, 43, and 47 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 40-41, 44-45, and 48-49 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claim, upon

which they ultimately depend. These dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish these dependent claims from the cited references. For at least these reasons, claims 40-41, 44-45, and 48-49 are not anticipated or made obvious by the prior art and/or the official notice outlined in the Office Action.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Marc S. Hanish/  
Marc S. Hanish  
Reg. No. 42,626

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
408-255-8001